REMARKS

Claims 22-36 and 40-50 remain in this application. Claims 37-39 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 22-23, 29-36, and 40-44 have been amended. Claims 45-50 have been added. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

35 U.S.C. §102(e) Rejection - Woo

The Examiner has rejected claims 22-36 and 38-44 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0132929 issued to Woo (hereinafter referred to as "Woo"). The Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over Woo.

Claim 22 recites a display comprising: "*a lamp to illuminate the display; and a heat pipe including a liquid capable of vaporizing coupled to the lamp to transfer heat from a heat generating component of a system to the lamp in the display, wherein the heat pipe is coupled to an end of the lamp*". Woo does not teach or suggest a heat pipe including a liquid that is capable of vaporizing.

Claim 29 recites a system comprising: "*a display and a lamp to illuminate the display; at least one heat generating component; a transfer unit to transfer heat from the heat generating component to the lamp; and a unit to control a level of heat provided to the lamp to maintain a level of brightness generated by the lamp*". Woo does not teach or suggest a unit to control a level of heat provided to the lamp to maintain a level of brightness generated by the lamp. As understood by Applicants, Woo discusses controlling a level of voltage and current provided to the lamp, not the level of heat provided to the lamp, in order to maintain a particular brightness (see e.g., Fig. 3 of Woo, and associated discussion thereof).

Claim 36 recites an apparatus comprising: "*at least one heat generating component; a transfer unit to transfer heat from the at least one heat generating component to a lamp of a display, wherein the transfer unit comprises a heat pipe including a liquid capable of vaporizing proximate the lamp, and wherein the transfer unit comprises a fan or synthetic jet unit to generate air movement across the heat pipe and have the heated air flow against the lamp*". Woo does not teach or suggest either: (a) heat pipes including liquids that are capable of vaporizing; or (b) a fan or synthetic jet unit to generate air movement across the heat pipe that is proximate a lamp and have the heated air flow against the lamp.

Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 requires every element of the claimed invention be **identically shown in a single prior art reference**. The Federal Circuit has indicated that the standard for measuring lack of novelty by anticipation is strict identity. "*For a prior art reference to anticipate in terms of 35 U.S.C. Section 102, every element of the claimed invention must be identically shown in a single reference.*" In Re Bond, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ.2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

For at least these reasons, independent claims 22, 29, and 36 are independently of one another believed to be allowable over Woo. The dependent claims of each of these respective independent claims are believed to be allowable therefor, as well as for the recitations independently set forth therein.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) Rejection – Woo and Fryers

The Examiner has rejected claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Woo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,330,154 issued to Fryers, et al. (hereinafter "Fryers"). Without admitting that Woo and Fryers may be combined, the Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims are allowable over any combination of Woo and Fryers.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the references or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest **all the claim limitations**. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

As discussed above, Woo does not teach or suggest certain of the limitations in each of the independent claims. These limitations which are not taught or suggested in Woo are also not taught or suggested in Fryers. Accordingly, any possible combination of Woo and Fryers does not teach or suggest all claim limitations of each of the respective independent claims.

For at least this reason, the independent claims, and their respective dependent claims, are believed to be allowable over any possible combination of Woo and Fryers, which combination may not even be appropriate.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending patentably define the subject invention over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and the claims be allowed at the earliest possible date.

Request For Telephone Interview

The Examiner is invited to call Brent E. Vecchia at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

Request For An Extension Of Time

The Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17 for such an extension.

Charge Our Deposit Account

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 1/17/06

Brent E. Vecchia
Reg. No. 48,011

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030
(303) 740-1980